

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11 and 13-26 are amended.

With respect to independent Claims 1, 14 and 22, see for example the originally filed application at numbered paragraphs [0112], [0125]. With respect to dependent Claims 5, 17 and 23, see for example the originally filed application at numbered paragraph [0154].

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 6, 11 and 19. Applicant respectfully submits that various amendments to Claims 6, 11 and 19 obviate these objections. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 5.3, 7.1, 8.1, 13.1, 14, 17.14, 19.14, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Popp (International Publication WO 01/82556 A2). the Examiner also rejects Claims 2-3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 6, 7.2, 7.3, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1-9.3, 10-12, 13.2, 13.3, 15-16, 17.15, 17.16, 18, 19.15, 19.16, 20, 21 and 26.22-26.25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Popp in view of King (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,471). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant first notes that the terminology “5.3” apparently indicates the Examiner is referring to Claim 5, dependent from Claim 3 (since Claim 5 depends from any one of Claims 1-3), and interprets similar terminology (e.g. “7.1”, “8.1”, ...) to have similar meaning.

Popp is directed to a server-side database of Internet connections, wherein a destination in the database is identified to a user using a keyword such as a company name or trademark, so that users of devices such as a WAP phone or a net appliance can navigate to a destination site using only a few keystrokes. Popp also discloses indexing individual words within a name as well as the first letters of a destination’s keyword, so

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/520,609
Attorney Docket Number: 316887.06
Application Filing Date: 08/31/2005

that when a query from a user contains only the first few characters of a keyword, the database or navigation engine can return a list of results for the user to select among.

However, Popp fails to disclose or suggest keywords that are associated with other, different keywords, for example associating a code “subscription” with other codes “telephone” and “movies”, as noted in numbered paragraph [0125] of the present application and variously encompassed by the claims. Popp likewise fails to disclose or suggest a terminal determining a code in response to a user’s input, sending the code to a server, receiving multiple associated codes from the server, sending a user’s selection of one of the multiple associated codes back to the server, and then receiving from the server a corresponding address and accessing the address, as variously encompassed by the pending claims.

In particular, Popp fails to disclose or suggest *“in response to a user input, and based on first parameters, displaying codes stored in a code base of the terminal to enable the user to select among the displayed codes, **transmitting a user-selected code to a routing server** configured to identify, based on second parameters, other codes associated with the user-selected code and stored in a base of the routing server, receiving the identified codes associated with the user-selected code from the routing server, wherein the identified codes are different from and do not include the user-selected code, displaying the identified codes at the terminal to enable the user to select among the identified codes; **transmitting a user-selected identified code to the routing server**; receiving from the routing server an address associated with the user-selected identified code; and automatically accessing the address”*, as recited in Claim 1, and similar features recited in independent Claims 14 and 22.

The relevant portion of King (columns 11, 12) describes saving lists of bookmarks on a server, for example by saving a bookmark URL and a corresponding name (see, e.g., King at C11/L57-59). Then, a remote device can request all or part of the stored list of bookmarks by sending a request to the bookmark server, for example (see,

e.g., King at C12/L5-6). The request can include a URL of the bookmark server, and an argument specifying a first entry in the list to send. See, e.g., King at C12/L5-16. King further discloses that the remote device can request modification of a bookmark by appending the bookmark server URL with arguments specifying a change to the selected bookmark and the desired change. See, e.g., King at C12/L17-25.

However, King apparently nothing about associating codes with other codes that in turn correspond to addresses, and fails to overcome the deficiencies of Popp described above with respect to the independent claims.

In addition, Popp and King further fail to disclose other claimed features.

For example, the Examiner acknowledges that Popp fails to disclose Claims 2, 22 and 26, and cites King for these features. But, King discloses a remote device requesting a bookmark server to change an entry stored in the bookmark server, not a server commanding a change in a terminal's code base, nor a server changing an address of the server stored by the terminal. King's remote device a mobile device or wireless telephone, see for example King at the Abstract and C4/L1-2. King does not disclose or suggest that its remote device is a server. Accordingly, Popp and King both fail to disclose or suggest a server configured to "*command a change in a code base in the terminal*", as recited in Claim 22, and "*changing the code base of the terminal or changing an address of the routing server stored by the terminal for transmitting a code to the routing server by transmitting a command from the routing server*", as recited in dependent Claim 2. Popp and King likewise fail to disclose or suggest a server configured to "*transmit a server or data address to the terminal, and command the terminal to store a dictionary, on the basis of the server or data address transmitted*", as recited in Claim 26.

In addition, with respect to independent Claims 1 and 14, Applicant notes that neither Popp nor King disclose or suggest storing a base of codes in a terminal. Popp does not disclose or suggest that its client 200 such as a handheld wireless device stores any keywords, but instead discloses near the bottom of page 5 that inputs from a user

such as fragments of a keyword are sent from the client 200 to the navigation engine in the Navigation Server 204, which then matches keywords to the fragment. King is likewise silent with respect to whether King's remote device includes a store of names that correspond to addresses. Accordingly, neither Popp nor King disclose or suggest "*codes stored in a code base of the terminal*" as recited in Claim 1, and similar features recited in Claim 14.

In addition, with respect to dependent Claims 5, 17 and 23, Applicant notes that Popp and King fail to disclose or suggest that "*the base of the routing server contains more codes than the code base of the terminal*", as recited in Claim 5, and similar features recited in Claims 17 and 23. Since neither Popp nor King disclose a code base of the terminal that stores codes, Popp and King likewise fail to disclose or suggest that the base of the routing server contains more codes than the code base of the terminal.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 5.3, 7.1, 8.1, 13.1, 14, 17.14, 19.14, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Popp, and of the rejection of Claims 2-3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 6, 7.2, 7.3, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1-9.3, 10-12, 13.2, 13.3, 15-16, 17.15, 17.16, 18, 19.15, 19.16, 20, 21 and 26.22-26.25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Popp in view of King, is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration on the merits and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any questions arise regarding this communication or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/520,609
Attorney Docket Number: 316887.06
Application Filing Date: 08/31/2005

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: January 23, 2009

By: /M. David Ream/
M. David Ream, Reg. No.: 35,333
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 538-5530
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

January 23, 2009
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/520,609
Attorney Docket Number: 316887.06
Application Filing Date: 08/31/2005